

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. XI. No. 1.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1807.

[PRICE 10D.]

" Upon the state of the continent of Europe, except as far as regards Hanover, we shall not, in the approaching negotiations, be allowed, in my opinion, to say a single word; and if we are allowed to have a footing there, it will be, because the French are convinced, that by leaving Hanover in the hands of our Sovereign, they shall always have a bridle in our mouths."—POLITICAL REGISTER, Vol. X. p. 966. June, 28th, 1806.

1]

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AMERICAN STATES. (Continued from Vol. X. p. 983.)—What had been reported to have been said in parliament, upon our dispute with the American States, was noticed in the preceding Number, Vol. X. page 1007. Since that, some remarks, upon the subject, have appeared in the newspapers, particularly in the paper called the *Courier*.—But, before I speak particularly upon the subject of these remarks, it seems necessary to notice an occurrence of considerable importance, which has recently taken place in the country, to which these remarks relate; which occurrence is no less than an accusation of treason, preferred, by one of the Attornies General of the United States, against Mr. Aaron Burr, who, as the public will recollect, was lately Vice President of that country. From the accounts which have reached this country, it would appear that Mr. Burr, who is a man of great ambition and of talents and courage equal thereto, had formed a scheme, which scheme he was actually preparing to put in practice, for separating the Western from the Eastern part of that immense country called the United States, and to erect a kingly government in the Western part, of which he himself intended to be king.—In this project, viewing it with a mere philosophical eye, I see nothing more objectionable, than the novel circumstance of there being a king of the name of *Aaron*; for, it is impossible for any man to make me believe, that the Western States will remain, or can remain, for ten years, at the utmost, members of the Confederation. Separated from the inhabited part of the Eastern States (or, speaking more properly, perhaps, the Atlantic States) by an almost impassable wilderness of more than four hundred miles across; having their out-let to the sea by a channel no where communicating with the Atlantic States; pursuing the same sort of traffic as the Atlantic States, and driving a trade to the same markets; under these circumstances, the Western States must necessarily be rivals of the Atlantic States, and the two sets of

[2

States must feel, with respect to each other, as rivals for gain generally feel. And, to check the effects of this feeling, there is wanting in America that *attachment to country*, which sometimes operates so powerfully in other parts of the world, and which has its foundation in circumstances of which a native American has no practical idea.—Mr. Burr *may* fail; but, I am not the man to say that he will fail; and, if he does, some other man will not: at any rate, the separation must take place, and when it does take place, it will astonish me if that which is now called the Federal Government should long remain in existence.—The remarks, above alluded to, in the *Courier*, are as follows: that news having been received from Charlestown, that some English goods had been seized, in virtue of the non-importation act, a deputation of American merchants waited, the other day, upon Lord Grenville to know how they should act, who told them, that the restraints, whatever they might be, *would not be of long duration*; whence the *Courier* concludes, that our ministers have *given up the point*. Whereupon, just as if the fact was notorious, the sagacious editor thus gravely proceeds: "We" (for they always speak in the style royal) "do not desire war with America, but we as little desire to see that system of concession to America continued, which has been adopted since the new ministers came into power. What right has America to expect concessions from us? Have we received any peculiar favour at her hands? Concessions must be as injurious to our commerce as to our national character. But, we confess, we are not without our apprehensions; the ministers having shown themselves as incompetent to conduct a negotiation, as to carry on war with vigour and decision."—The modesty of this last remark, coming from a partizan of the Pitts, must strike every one! What opportunities have the ministers had to carry on war with vigour and decision? The Pitts carried it on with vigour and decision, indeed, the year before! Who could



the ministers get at to make war upon, except the *Threshers* in Ireland, upon whom, indeed, the Pitts would have made vigorous war long enough ago? The novelty of this writer's remarks, with regard to concessions, must amuse every one who read the Register of the 20th of December; but, to the truth, which he did me the honour to borrow from me, he has added matter of his own of a directly contrary description. The *present ministers* have made no concessions to the American States; and none, I hope, they will make. The concessions were all made by the Pitts and the Addingtons, while those latter were under the absolute controul of the former. It was they who gave up, in the meanest manner, the point so solemnly settled by the treaty of 1794. That concession not only drew from us about three millions in taxes, as will appear from the accounts laid before parliament, but it encouraged the Americans to demand further and still more dangerous concessions now. Had it not been for those concessions, the concessions now dreaded by the enlightened and public-spirited editor of the *Courier* never would have been dreamed of on either side of the Atlantic.—This wise man talks about injury to our *commerce* from the concessions, which, in the tone of the ignorant speech attributed to Mr. Perceval, he affects to dread; but, supposing the concessions to take place, they would not at all injure our commerce, which consists of buying and selling goods. It is our fleets that they would injure; our naval power; our means of injuring our enemy; and, of course, our means of defending ourselves; all which might be reduced to nothing, and our commerce be still as flourishing as ever.—As to the practicability, however, of injuring even this commerce by the means of a non-importation act in America, the intelligence which I have received, and which comes down so late as the 2d of December, fully warrants all that I before said upon the subject, and the sum total of which was, that, to carry such an act into execution, and to adhere to it for any length of time, was *impossible*. It is said, that some English goods have, in virtue of the act, been siezed at Charlestown. But, at Philadelphia and New York, if my intelligence be correct, there was no interruption at all to importation; and, so little did any one expect that the act would be *enforced*, that very few importers had thought it prudent to order any additional supply in consequence of it. That the act may be partially executed; that a blustering appearance of resolution may be exhibited for some weeks, or for some

months, is possible; but, that it should be continued in force, or that it should be at all, in any port, obeyed, as a *law* ought to be obeyed, is, I again assert, *impossible*. It was a hasty effusion of vanity and ignorance. A sort of trick to try us. And, in the minds of some few persons, amongst whom we may number the President, perhaps, it proceeded from philosophical notions, very good in themselves, but for the acting upon which the Americans are much too far gone in a contempt for every thing not tending to the accumulation of riches.—It was upon the ground of opinions like these, I hope, that Lord Grenville gave the answer ascribed to him; that he told the American merchants, that the restraints could not be of long duration; and not upon the ground of concessions that he had made, or was about to make; for, if *he* make such concessions as are affected to be apprehended by the speech ascribed to Mr. Perceval, then, indeed, will he be worthy of every epithet descriptive of baseness and apostacy in their most odious character and degree.—I do not, however, believe, that he will so act. To concede a trifling point as to a particular vessel or two, seized under peculiar circumstances, and where the seizures may even *appear* to militate against the *conceding* regulations of the *Pitts and Addingtons*, I, for my part, should have no objection; but, to give up our right, or, in the least, to relax in the assertion and exercise of our right, to search neutral vessels, and therein to sieze the property of our enemies, however covered, and wherever coming from, would sink my Lord Grenville ten million of fathoms below even Pitt himself.—In the possession of this right; not in the mere formal claim and recognition of it, but in the substantial possession of it; in the unrelaxed exercise of it towards all nations without exception; it is in this that consists our maritime superiority. Without this right that superiority could not exist for two years; and this is a fact well known to our implacable and well-counselled enemy. Concession to the American States must, and would, be followed by similar concessions to other powers; and, I must confess, that, if such concessions were made, I should regard the complete overthrow of the present government of this country as certain.—This being my opinion, I feel as anxious, I trust, and a little more so, upon the subject, than the author of the speech ascribed to Mr. Perceval, who, if he were well to examine his heart, would, I am afraid, find little else than a love of place and of pelf at the bottom of it; but, I cannot say, that I partake much in his *apprehensions*,

especially when I find them founded upon what the ministers *have done* in the way of conceding to America, alluding to what was no concession at all, but a measure of great advantage to both countries, without creating the possibility of producing in time an injury to either, though the contrary was asserted in a speech of the Master of the Rolls which, under the guise of legal gravity, exhibited more ignorance in statement and more sophistry in reasoning than any speech that I remember ever to have read.

MESSRS. PAULL AND ELLIOT.—It appears, from the public papers, that the challenge, which has taken place between these gentlemen, has had a curious enough termination. Some friend, having received the hint, no doubt, gave information to the police magistrates, who bound the parties over to keep the peace, in a bond of 1,500 pounds from each party and his sureties. Whereupon, it seems, Mr. Paull proposed a trip to the nearest port upon the Continent, with a view of avoiding the effects of a forfeiture of the recognizance. "No," says the Colonel and Brewer, "that does not suit me; but, I am ready to set the bonds at defiance." To which Mr. Paull is said to have replied, that he had no objection to do the same, provided the Brewer would pay the forfeiture on both sides, which, apparently, the latter refused to do; and thus have they both *established their reputations*, as men of valour, and gentlemen, and men of honour! But, to us, who are spectators of all this, it may be allowed to make a remark or two, especially as this case seems to elucidate a little the nature of the principles of duelling.—Why should the parties feel any restraint in consequence of the bonds to keep the peace? To have fought a duel *before* would have been to commit a breach of the peace; and to have killed his antagonist would, in either of the parties, have been a capital offence. Whence, then, proceeds their respect, their great veneration for the law, after the entering into recognizances? Has it been excited in their bosoms by the presence and the admonitions of Messrs. Graham, Gifford, and Bond? I think not; for though it is, doubtless, next to impossible to listen to the reproof of these grave and venerable personages without being thereby deeply affected, yet, so hardened do we find Messrs. Paull and Elliott, or, more properly speaking, so powerfully urged on by their valourous spirits and their delicate sense of honour, that one of them still proposes to flee to distant lands to decide the point, and the other proposes to forfeit his recognizances.—At this point, however, *valour*, which had pricked them

on so far, seems to have slackened his hand; to have halted a little, and to have listened to his "better half," *discretion*; for the Brewer's affairs will not permit him to take a trip to the Continent, and Mr. Paull does not choose to forfeit his recognizances.—Fielding says, that when people are, on both sides, heartily disposed either to fight or to marry, they will find some way or other of getting at it in spite of all the world; and, it may be added, with equal truth, that, when they, at the bottom of their hearts, wish to avoid either fighting or marrying, in spite of all the world, avoid it they will.—It is something truly curious, that each of these gentlemen should have fallen upon an expedient; and, upon an expedient, too, which he was pretty certain that the other would reject! But, to talk of *affairs* not permitting them to fulfil their purposes; to talk about *interest* after you have gone so far as to set your life at hazard for the sake of your honour; to talk about obstacles in bonds to keep the peace; to talk this way will, be you assured, gentlemen, deceive nobody. Supposing, for instance, that one, or both of you, are without the means of paying the forfeited recognizances. Such a supposition serves to show, in another light, the absurdity of the principles of duelling; but, suppose it to be the case; and then, I ask, why that should prevent you from fighting? Do you answer, that the debt would throw you into jail? What! Your honour and valour can *calculate*, then! Your *honour* has its price; its pecuniary considerations; it can make compromises with your interest! In short, it is, used in this way, a word that means any thing, or nothing. You never wished to fight, unless you could have done it without bodily risk. This is evident enough; but, you were desirous of acquiring the reputation of being eager to fight, and for this I blame you.—To suppose, that this challenging and accepting of a challenge; that the talk about the continent on one side, and about a readiness to forfeit the recognizances, on the other side; to suppose that all this will produce any effect in favour of the parties, in the estimation of the public, is to discover folly most egregious. If I accuse a man of being a liar or a thief, is the accusation disproved by his challenging to fight me? If the Sheridans, in the fulness of their insolence fed from the public purse, represent Mr. Paull as a tailor, and exhibit him wielding his sheers, his yard, and his goose, will his fighting a duel remove any part of the impression they may, by such devices, have produced? Will it not rather tend to confirm it? For, look at the duellists, and you will

find, that nine out of ten fall upon that way of giving themselves consequence in the eyes of the world. It is one way of rising into genteel life. There is many a low scoundrel who has become a heavy feeder upon the public in virtue of his having been an agent in some paper-pellet duelling affair. The most notorious cowards we have seen fighting duels; seen them the *patrons* of duelling. This is the way (taking care to provide against serious consequences) that they *recover their reputation!* Amongst all the effects of duelling this is the worst, that it gives the reputation of bravery to the most flagrant of cowards. Find me a man, if he be a soldier by profession, who seems to have been a coward from his mother's womb; who, in cases where fighting was out of the question, has given constant proof of his cowardice in practising the sister vice of cruelty; who, in all the transactions of his life has been the supple slave of those who had power to cope with him, and the merciless oppressor of those who had the misfortune to fall under his clutches, and yet who were not mean enough to lick his feet; who, a coward so rank in the field as to communicate his timidity and baseness to others; who never faced any man in his life; who has fled from the enemy with an uniformity, an alacrity, a velocity and a degree of address, that bespeak instinctive cowardice: find me such a man, though, for the honour of human nature, (and for the sake of the liberty of the press) let us hope there is not such a man upon the face of the earth; but, if you can find me such a man, I will engage, that he shall not only have fought duels himself, but that he shall be a big talker about the necessity of duelling amongst others; and that, in short, he shall not be more distinguished for the rankness of his cowardice than for having recourse to these means of endeavouring to disguise it from the world.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.—The *Amendment*, as it is called, which is stated, in the public prints, to have been read, in the House of Commons by Mr. Canning; which has since been published under his name; and which, in a subsequent page of this sheet the reader will find copied from the *Courier* newspaper of the 22d ultimo, has certainly the merit of *novelty* as to form and style; but, that that is its sole merit will, I think, be readily allowed by every man, who is at all a judge of the matter. There is in it, nothing dignified, nothing solid, nothing impressive, nothing either eloquent or elegant. It breathes neither earnestness nor sincerity, neither loyalty nor patriotism. Its panegyrics may well be mistaken for irony; and its

censure consists of a wearisome series of slack-twisted and pointless sarcasm, discovering at once both impotence and malice.—From this general description of the publication (for it is as a publication in the newspapers that I comment upon it), and which description, I am satisfied, the reader will, upon a reference to the paper itself, find to be just, I will proceed to offer a few remarks upon a particular clause or two of it, the clauses having been numbered by me for the purpose of saving room in quotation.—In the 19th clause, the author expresses the readiness of himself and his friends to share, not in making sacrifices themselves, but in imposing fresh burthens upon the people! This is a mark of generosity and public-spirit well worthy of the author of such a paper; but, he is greatly mistaken, when he states, that all ranks of the community are convinced of the *necessity* of such sacrifices. On the contrary, all ranks of the community, that of placemen, pensioners, and taxers excepted, are thoroughly convinced, that any new burdens upon the people would be rendered unnecessary, if such persons, for instance, as Mr. Rose, Mr. Huskisson, the Sheridans, Mr. Perceval (who has a place of *profit* yet), Mr. Long, Mrs. Long, the relations of Mr. Canning, and, I believe, Mr. Canning himself, were to receive nothing from the public purse. Of no proposition for economy of this sort do we hear in the *amendment* before us; and, the author of it may be assured, that all his general expressions of compassion for the people; all his affected regret and pain at being compelled to add to their distress, will pass for just what they are worth, and no more.—In the 22d clause this verbose amender complains of the time and the manner, in which the late parliament was put an end to, and talks of the *surprise* and *deception* attending the exercise of the king's prerogative in that instance. Who were the parties surprised and deceived one may guess; but, as to the *people*; as to the *electors*, how could they be surprised or deceived? The sham-patriots, the sham-loyalists, the bribers, the corruptors might be taken by surprise, indeed; but, the electors are *always ready*. Their functions are very simple; and the advantage of a dissolution to them is not at all lessened by the circumstance of its taking place from the desire of one party to crush another party; because, even supposing both parties to be bad, there are degrees in badness, and the people have an opportunity of choosing the best, or more properly speaking, the least bad. It is the manner of such men as this author to represent the *nation* as being on his side. Not

one honest man is there, I will venture to say, on his side upon this occasion; and, talk as long as he will about the "*deep sentiment*" of the people; string together, if he will, millions of such unmeaning phrases, not one man of sense will be persuaded to regret the death, timely or untimely, of the Pitt-debt and Pitt-monument parliament.—In the 23d and 24th clauses he inveighs against ministerial interference in elections, and expresses his fears, that they are calculated to favour the *erroneous* belief, that the House of Commons, as at present returned, is an *inadequate representative of the people*.—Now, is it possible, for any one to look upon this as having been uttered otherwise than in jest? And, as the Morning Chronicle has well observed, it does require no common powers of face for Mr. Rose and his friends to stand up in St. Stephen's Chapel, and there, in a voice loud enough to be heard, complain of ministerial influence in elections! It is true, that, in Hampshire, there was an interference, which, as relating to a *county*, was of a new sort. A member was proscribed for having voted against the ministers; but, in supporting this member upon the ground of his having been so proscribed, and also upon the ground of his having served in parliament sixteen years without ever having touched the public money, or asked a favour of any minister either for himself or his relations; in thus acting, does Mr. Canning think, that the independent part of the freeholders regarded themselves as supporting Mr. Rose, and expressing their approbation of the undue influence, which he and the Pitt ministry had exerted for so many, many years? Does he really think that we were such dupes? We stood forward for independence; for an unbiassed exercise of the elective franchise and of the duties of members of parliament; for *unplaced and unpensioned representatives*. These were our principles, not only understood, but clearly and fully expressed. It was to persons voting upon these principles that Sir Henry Mildmay and Mr. Chute owed more than one half of their support; and, though Mr. Rose was found upon the same side, will Mr. Canning pretend to believe, that that support was given to Mr. Rose, and was expressive of an approbation of his conduct during the days of Pitt, when he exercised in Hampshire a sway as complete, as to offices and rewards, as ever petty despot in Germany exercised over his dominions?—There is a petition to be presented to parliament, from the county of Hants, complaining of the interference of government in the recent election. This is a very proper step.

It will produce inquiry and discussion? We shall, when this petition comes, see who has interfered most, Lord Temple or Mr. Rose; and, be the preponderance which way it will, we shall, I trust, profit from the information, which ought to be, and which, I hope, will be, clearly and amply communicated to every freeholder in the county. What I am most afraid of is, that the petition will never reach St. Stephen's; that, having taken time to cool, the parties will exclaim, "brother, brother! we are both in the wrong;" and that, thus, the county will be deprived of the advantages of so interesting a development. Yet, there are some men amongst the petitioners, and particularly Sir Henry Mildmay, whose conduct upon this occasion, has been highly praise-worthy, who will not, one would think, be induced to eat their words, merely because it would be convenient for a few party intriguers, who have long made use of them, and who are, I fear, even now making use of them to further their own ambitious and greedy purposes. Nothing so offends my senses; nothing is so shocking, as to see a man like Sir Henry Mildmay; a man of large fortune, of ancient family, of great county connections, an instrument in the hands of such persons as a Canning or a Sheridan or a Rose or a Huskisson. To see an upstart, a mere minion of an overbearing and insolent minister; a mere thing of his creation; as it were the spittle from his lips; to see such a thing sent to take the command of a county, to dictate to magistrates, sheriffs, and Lords Lieutenant; and to see property and birth and rank all bowing down before him; what can be so disgusting and so loathsome! But, if they are prone to bend thus, let them bend; let them go downwards, let them receive the reward of their baseness; and let there, for God's sake, be, at last, no hand to save them.—Let the petition of Hampshire end as it may, however, the election has done good; a great deal of good; and Mr. Canning will do good too every time he shall agitate the subject; for, though *his* constituents, the *free and independent* electors of the borough of Newtown in the Isle of Wight, may, and, I dare say, do, consider the House of Commons, as at present returned, a perfectly adequate representation of the people, the freeholders of Hampshire may turn the development of ministerial influence to good account. Let us have the facts. It is the facts; a good exposure of facts, which, at this moment, is of much more importance to the country, than is the choice of a member or two to serve in parliament, where the greatest

possible use any member can be of is to carry on this same work of exposure.—Mr. Canning's amendment, proposes, in conclusion to assure the King, that whatever may have been the misconduct of his ministers, he and his associates are ready to second them in whatever measures they may adopt for drawing money from the people, and, of course, for maintaining this same sort of power, of the exercise of which he complains! There is no doubt of that. Nobody was foolish enough to imagine that he, or his associates, meant to do any thing hostile to *the system*; and, unless that be done, there is no man of sense that expects the least good from their hostility.—We will now leave Mr. Canning and his amendment, and proceed to other matters.—On the 22d of December, Mr. Vansittart, a Secretary of the Treasury, rose, in the House of Commons, and moved, in about six words, that *a supply be granted to His Majesty*, and that the whole House should, the next day, be formed into a committee to take the motion into consideration. Not a word, by way of preface, appears to have been thought necessary for this. If any member wants to have a document relative to the expenditure of the public money, he must give a notice, several days before hand, that he *intends* to make a motion; but, here, where millions are going to be granted, no notice at all is thought necessary; and, upon such occasions the *game* debaters do not attend, it being certain that no one will presume to make any objection! And yet we are told about guardians of the people's treasure; and those romance writers, De L'homme, and others, amuse us with tales about their holding the purse strings!—On the next day the House went into a committee (Lord Henry Petty in the Chair) to consider of the motion for granting a supply to his Majesty. As soon as the formality of taking the chair was over, Mr. Vansittart moved, that *a supply be granted to his Majesty*, which was instantly agreed to without a word by way of speech upon the subject; and the *report of the committee* was ordered to be received the next day. On the next day it was accordingly brought up. And this is the way in which millions upon millions are granted. Not an account; not a single estimate; not a voucher of any kind, whether as to receipt or expenditure, was yet before the House. How were the members to know what money ought to be granted? How were they to possess any information upon the subject? They were new men; or, a new House at least; but, the moment they are met, they fall to granting money with as much alacrity and cheer-

fulness as if to grant money had been the habit and the delight of their lives.—On the 24th of December, Lord Folkestone, who had, on a former day, presented a petition from certain Electors of Westminster against the return of Mr. Sheridan, stated, that, on account of the great mass of evidence that was to be brought before the committee appointed to try the merits of this petition, it would be necessary to name a more distant day than the 13th of January, (the day before named) for the meeting of the committee. He accordingly made a motion to put it off until the 24th of February.—Mr. Sheridan, in assenting to this motion, took occasion to notice what Mr. Perceval had, in the debate upon the address, said about the horses of government being yoked to his, Mr. Sheridan's car. This sarcastic observation of Mr. Perceval was noticed in my last Number. Some reply was to be expected. Things would have been in a bad way indeed, if the royal blood of the house of Sheridan (see his speech at the Play-Actors' dinner) had not shewn a little warmth upon such an occasion. The cause of royalty, "regular government, social order, morality, and religion," as his friend John Bowles has it, would have been indeed a falling cause, if this champion of them all could have hammered out of his head nothing to say, by way of answer to Mr. Perceval. What has been, in the news-papers, reported as his answer, the reader shall now see; and, the friends of "royalty, regular government, social order, morality, and our holy religion," which words, according to their use of them, mean such a state of things, no matter what it be, as will enable them to live in idleness upon the fruit of the people's labour; truly, I am of opinion that this loyal and godly description of persons will experience no small pain at perceiving that two persons, whose sentiments, as to all the main points, that is to say, the points relating to places and pensions are precisely the same; yes, I cannot but think, that the friends of "our holy religion," as John Bowles says, will be grieved to the very soul at witnessing the marks of a misunderstanding between Messrs. Sheridan and Perceval. But, whatever grief it may occasion, I must here give an account of the debate, as it is called, beginning with the printed speech ascribed to the royal-blooded Treasurer of the Navy.—"He would take this occasion "to advert to something that had fallen from "a learned gentleman opposite (Mr. Perceval) on a former day, in his absence— "(Hear! hear! from Mr. Perceval.) He "was happy to hear this challenge from the "learned gent., particularly as it was a

“ proof that he continued in the same mind
 “ on this subject, which was not his general
 “ practice. (*A laugh.*)—The learned gent.
 “ had talked a great deal of his want of
 “ popularity, and had observed, with a wit
 “ correspondent with his candour, that it
 “ was not till the government horses had
 “ been yoked to his car that he had been
 “ brought in. Now though His Majesty
 “ had thought him worthy to hold an office
 “ of trust and emolument, he was bold to
 “ think, whatever the learned gent. and
 “ some few other clamorous persons may
 “ think, that his claim to public support
 “ was not thereby lessened. There was a
 “ sort of report that he was to take another
 “ office, the Chiltern Hundreds, for the
 “ purpose of vacating his seat. (*A laugh.*)
 “ He had no objection to take that office,
 “ if the learned gent. also would take it, and
 “ bring his popularity to the test by facing
 “ him on the hustings in Covent-Garden.—
 “ (*A laugh.*)”—A laugh! What at? Do
 you see any thing to laugh at here, reader?
 Here are three laughs put down; and, if
 one could believe that they really took place,
 no better criterion would be wanted where-
 by to judge of the audience. Does the rea-
 der see any wit? Any point? Any thing
 calculated to throw ridicule upon the oppo-
 nent? A shake of the head, accompanied
 with a smile of contempt, this publication
 may occasion in a company of sensible men;
 but, as to laughter at such blunt and bung-
 ling attempts at sarcastic wit, it never can
 find place, except amongst such oafs as are
 seen shaking their sides at the grimaces of
 the Drury-Lane pantomimes.—But, be-
 fore we proceed any further in our comments,
 let us see the speech attributed to Mr. Per-
 ceval, as it was published in the news-papers.
 —“ He said, that instead of forcing this
 “ matter forward on a former night, he had
 “ expressly abstained from agitating it, on
 “ the ground of the absence of the right hon.
 “ gent. The noble lord (H. Petty) had,
 “ however, ingeniously put into his mouth
 “ the expressions now brought forward by
 “ the learned gent., but he had disclaimed
 “ them. He had, however, no hesitation
 “ now, nor at any time, to answer for what
 “ he did say. The expression, the wit of
 “ which the right hon. gent. described to
 “ be equal to its candour, arose from the
 “ accident of his having seen the right hon.
 “ gent. parading the streets in a triumphal
 “ car, decorated with laurels. (*A loud*
 “ *laugh.*) The right hon. gent. had said
 “ that it was contrary to his practice to ad-
 “ here to his opinions. That was an accu-
 “ sation that came rather oddly from the

“ right hon. gent., and those who sat with
 “ him on that side of the house. With
 “ respect to himself, he was not aware of
 “ any such deficiency in adhering to his
 “ opinions, as the right hon. gent. imputed
 “ to him. Certainly his opinions on the
 “ subject now before the house had under-
 “ gone no change, and he saw no reason to
 “ change them. With respect to the right
 “ hon. gent's. challenge to meet him on the
 “ Hustings at Covent-Garden, he had to
 “ excuse himself, on the ground that he had
 “ constituents who had shewn him uniform
 “ favour, since they had returned him to
 “ the first Parliament he had sat in. These
 “ constituents he was attached to, and was
 “ unwilling to desert them for the ambition
 “ of representing any greater place. The
 “ right hon. gent. had at times spoken of a
 “ similar attachment, though he had after-
 “ wards found it so easy to get rid of it. At
 “ least such was the amount of what was
 “ represented in the news-papers, in the
 “ right hon. gent's. name. But, perhaps,
 “ what was thus stated on the subject, was
 “ not authentic. It was easy to credit an
 “ excuse of that kind from the extravan-
 “ cies contained in the speeches imputed to
 “ the right hon. gentleman.”—The only
 laugh given to this speech was natural
 enough. Not that there is any thing very
 original or witty in Mr. Perceval's account
 of the triumphal car; but, it was impossible
 to be put in mind of that car; it was impos-
 sible for any one to mention it with apparent
 seriousness, without bursting out into laugh-
 ter. The thing was so ridiculous; it was
 such a studied attempt to disguise a defeat;
 there was such a similarity between this pro-
 cession and that of Blue-Beard; there were
 so many of the persons and of the materials of
 the Theatre Royal actually employed about it;
 the piece was so well known to have been
 got up by Johnson, the Property-Man of
 that play-house; and the trick so complete-
 ly failed, the laurels were so thickly covered
 with mud, by the very persons whom the
 device was intended to blind and mislead;
 in short, the thing had been a subject of
 such universal ridicule, that, to excite a
 burst of laughter in the House, Mr. Perceval
 had only to allude to it.—The tenant of
 the car, the hero of the pantomime, seemed
 to feel this, as appeared from his reply. He
 “ denied that he had deserted the Electors
 “ of Stafford. He had offered himself for
 “ Westminster by *their express permission.*
 “ The triumphal car, which had excited
 “ the learned gentleman's spleen, was *not*
 “ so very brilliant, that it might not have
 “ escaped his sarcasm. (*hear, hear!*)

"learned gent.'s remarks that he complained of, but the prejudice they were calculated to cast on a contested Election, on which the learned gent. himself may be called upon to be a judge."—No; the car was not so very brilliant, indeed, unless a mixture of laurel-leaves and mud make a brilliant appearance. It has been denied by some of the suborned daily prints, that mud was thrown at the heroes, seated in this car; but, in their zeal for those heroes, these same prints, not aware of the consequences, told their readers, of the contemptuous and insolent (as they had the assurance to call it) behaviour of the populace, one of whom was actually taken up, and carried before the magistrates at the police-office, for throwing mud at the tenants of the triumphal car. Oh, what would the princely family of Sheridan now give, if the great head of it had never mounted that car! I have heard that the gentleman is fond of *fame*; and that he has now taken the right road to it no one can doubt.—The speech ascribed to Mr. Sheridan taunts Mr. Perceval with a changeable disposition. I have never perceived such a disposition in that gentleman. It has not, as far as I have observed, been visible in his actions. He has uniformly and steadily stuck to Pitt and his system; and, my objection to him is, that he clings to the system even now. But, as he is reported to have observed upon this occasion, such a charge sounds rather oddly from Mr. Sheridan, who has, both in generals and particulars, abandoned, since he and his son came into the receipt of the public money, every great principle that he ever before professed, and every pledge he ever gave. I will mention two instances by way of specimen. He has been always a loud declaimer for the liberty of the press and for publicity upon all subjects. During the last session of parliament he attended in the House to take a part in discussion only five times; and, one of those times was for the express purpose of preventing the first and most important charge against Lord Wellesley from being printed; in which undertaking he succeeded. The other instance that I shall now mention is, that, when Mr. Nicholl had undertaken the affair of the Carnatic, seeing that Mr. Sheridan was backward about it, the latter resumed the undertaking, pledged himself most solemnly to bring it forward, called for papers, the printing of which cost the nation many hundreds of pounds, and then he, in the last sessions of parliament, abandoned it, from the same motive, and with full as little compunction as his worthy associate the

Spartan General, abandoned the cause of Colonel Johnstone. And, is it this man, whom we now hear reproaching others with a disposition to change! Talk of the face of George Rose, indeed! I have noted down *five and twenty* public pledges that Mr. Sheridan has abandoned. They shall all be detailed one of these days.—The part of the reported speech of Mr. Sheridan which relates to the *place* bestowed upon him by his Majesty, and the doctrine, that he was not, on that account the less entitled to public support, are passed over in silence in the speech attributed to Mr. Perceval. They were here "brothers," and they might be "both in the wrong." But, does Mr. Sheridan think, that we are so ignorant as not to understand enough of such concerns to be able to perceive *how* it was that "his Majesty had thought him *worthy* to hold "an office of trust and emolument"? Does he think, that we do not understand all this; This is not the first time by thousands that we have heard men urge, as a proof of their worthiness, the possession of that of which we contend they are unworthy. This was the standing argument of Pitt and all his minions. It was the argument of Cavendish Bradshaw at Honiton; where he, too, told the people, that "his Majesty had thought him *worthy* of a place of trust and emolument." In short it is the argument of every one who lives upon the taxes, from the very highest to the very lowest of the innumerable host. —As to the electors of Stafford giving Mr. Sheridan their *express permission* to stand for Westminster, I have no doubt of the fact, which, I think, is pretty fully proved, in their giving his son permission also to stand for Westminster, or any other place that he, or his father, might choose. Nor do I at all doubt of the *unshaken attachment* of Mr. Perceval's constituents to him. They have always returned him, he says, and, I dare say they always will remain as firmly attached to him as the free and independent electors of Gatton are to Colonel Wood. Mr. Perceval is a prudent man, and he does very right to decline a meeting with Mr. Sheridan upon the hustings in Covent Garden; not that I think he would be defeated; for, really, the electors would be fairly posed, as the old women say; but, Mr. Perceval saw, he says, *the triumphal car*, whence he would not fail to take the hint! It was bravery truly worthy of the royal family of Sheridan to throw down the gauntlet to Mr. Perceval. As if he had said, I'll face *you* at any rate! I am not so unpopular as you. Will he meet Mr. Paull? Will he ever dare meet him, or any man of the

“ It was not, however, the severity of the same spirit and the same principles? He has affected contempt for Mr. Paull; but, at the bottom of his heart, he dreads him more than he does all the other men in the world. His life will now be a life of continual anxiety and alarm. The petition may, possibly, fail of success. He may here be saved by some difficulty in bringing home the acts to himself or his agents. But, he is never, for one moment, secure against another dissolution of parliament; which may happen any morning or afternoon that he lives. He may awake any day, and find himself no longer a law-giver. And then comes on his shaking fit. Give us, oh, good ministers! give us but another dissolution! Give us but one more opportunity to demolish him! Toss him down only once more before us! And if we suffer him to return to you a member for Westminster, then despise us as much as he hates and fears us now.—Enough, for the present, of the contest for popularity between Messrs Perceval and Sheridan. A subject of a more serious nature calls for your attention; I mean the motion made on the 24th of December, in the House of Commons, by Mr. BIDDULPH, for discontinuing the salary or allowance to the *Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means*. The reasons, upon which this motion was founded, cannot be better stated than in the reputed speech of Mr. Biddulph himself.—“ He adverted to the economy which the Speech delivered in his Majesty’s name, on opening the Session, recommended, in the great exertions that would be necessary, in addition to those already borne by his Majesty’s people. It was essential to the public, that his Majesty’s paternal recommendation was not a mere dead letter in the mouths of his Majesty’s ministers. In the great difficulties and great demands of the present exigency, it was essential to shew the public, that the smallest practical savings would be attended to. He thought it right to bring forward this motion thus early, before any individual should undertake the duties of the office on the faith of a salary. He was sure the hon. gent. who was said to be named to the office (Mr. Hobhouse) would not suppose he meant any thing personal to him, knowing, as he must, that from his earliest years he had the highest esteem for his character and abilities. He thought that this was an instance in which the economy recommended in his Majesty’s Speech may be well put in practice. No man should, in his

“ opinion, be paid for his duty in the House of Commons, with the exception only of the person who filled the chair, whose salary was meant to support the dignity of the House, as well as to reward his labour. There were two modes in which the duties of the office might be discharged. The members might divide the trouble among themselves, and take it by turns; or those who were already paid by Government for very trifling services might well discharge this duty in addition. He would ask, were the junior Lords of the Treasury, who had only a few papers to sign, so exhausted in mind and body as to be unable to come down to the House to perform the duties of their office? He thought this retrenchment would be a proof to the public that his Majesty’s Ministers meant to fulfil the pledge of economy, in which he believed them sincere. It was thought, by many persons of deep reflection, that some great change was necessary to save the country. A rigorous economy had not yet been tried, and he recommended it as the first and easiest expedient. He moved, a resolution: *That the practice of giving a salary to the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means was unnecessary, and in the present circumstances of the country inexpedient.*—Let us hear the answer of Lord Howick before we proceed to make our remarks; though one would naturally have wondered what other answer than that of immediate assent should be given to a proposition so reasonable as that expressed in this resolution; what then must have been the sorrow of every man, who wishes well to the country, at being informed by the reports of the debates, that it was some time before any members could be found to second the motion! —“ His Lordship thanked the Honorable Gentleman for the favourable sentiments he entertained of his Majesty’s Ministers, who he assured him were determined to practise the economy recommended in his Majesty’s Speech. He did not, however, think that the retrenchment recommended by the Hon. Gent. could come within the desire of his Majesty or the expectation of the public. The Hon. Gent. was mistaken in thinking that any one had been appointed to the office. The office was still vacant till it should be the pleasure of the House to call somebody to the Chair, when the House should resolve itself into the Committee. The Hon. Gent. was also mistaken in thinking there was a sa-



lary annexed to the situation. There had been a salary from the Civil List from the Revolution, till within these few years, when it seemed to the House inconsistent that any Officers of its body should have a salary from the Crown. An annual vote of remuneration was then substituted, to which the labour of the office was well entitled. The chairman of the committee of ways and means had to perform in the chair of that committee the same duties as the speaker in the chair of the House. He had to attend to all public bills that came before the House, to watch their various stages, and to be present every day in the House, from its meeting to its rising, for the purpose of doing his duty with respect to them. Was this a task undeserving of remuneration? As to the idea of its being distributed between the members, it would in that case be every body's business, and that would be nobody's business. With respect to the duty being performed by any other servant of government, if the hon. gent. thought there were any servants of government who had no business attached to their offices, let him move for the abolition of those offices. The business of this office was certainly enough to demand the whole attention of an able and attentive person, and ought not to be exempt from remuneration, such as in the opinion of the House it should appear to merit at the close of the session, when the vote was brought forward. That would be the proper time for the hon. gentleman's motion, on which he should move the order of the day."—Which he did; and thus this first proposition, made to the new parliament, for saving the public money, was got rid of! A truly auspicious commencement!—It is no matter, whether the 1,200*l.* a year, given in this way to a member of the House of Commons by the members of the House of Commons; taken out of the public purse by "the guardians of the public purse," and given to one of themselves; taken out of the purse by one of "the holders of the purse-strings" and given by themselves to one of themselves; a part of the supplies of which he himself is to attend to the granting of: it is no matter, whether this sum be paid under the name of salary, or allowance, or remuneration: it is a sum, which the House of Commons takes from the people annually and gives to one of themselves, and it is attended with this peculiar circumstance, that it is given to him for services which he performs as a member of parliament, which are

performed within the walls of that House, and which it is the duty of every member of that house to understand and to perform, if required. No matter, therefore, my Lord Howick, whether it be called a salary or a remuneration.—Nor is there, my lord, any force in your argument built on precedent. Many bad things were done about the time of the blessed Revolution; and, if the House of Commons thought it inconsistent that the Chairman should stand upon the Revolution footing, it proves that the establishment was not so deeply covered with the hoar of antiquity but that it might be touched. It is only, therefore, touching it a little harder, and down it goes. In the act of settlement, though Mr. Whitbread seems to have forgotten it; in the act of the people of England which settled the crown upon his Majesty's family, it was most carefully provided, that no placeman or pensioner should sit in the House of Commons. Look round you, my Lord, and you will see some hundreds of proofs that this provision has been annulled. Why, then, refer to the period of the Revolution for precedents which are to silence every objecter? From precedents from which there lies no appeal either to the reason of the case or to the necessities of the times? Unless, indeed, your Lordship be prepared to maintain, that acts and customs favouring the liberty and the property of the subject are, and ought to be, mutable; while every act and every custom making against that liberty and property, are, and ought to be, unchangeable in their nature and eternal in their duration. This was not the sort of doctrine, which your lordship used to delight in, when, under your former, and, with me, better name of Mr. Grey, you described, and inveighed against, the waste of the public money, and the numerous corruptions, which you expressed so anxious, and, as I thought, so sincere, a desire to see reformed.—Begging your pardon for having thus digressed, and especially to remind you of your language and opinions when out of office, I now proceed to observe, that the printer has made your lordship say, that the duties of the Chairman were *like those of the Speaker*; where an inference was left to be drawn, that, as one had a salary, so ought the other. But, my lord, Mr. Biddulph had made the distinction between the Speaker and the Chairman; and, the fact is, that the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, as such, has no more to do than *every* chairman of *every* committee of the whole House has; that is to say, to read the motions, to put the questions, to call to order, and to make the report. You tell us, that, it is the

duty of the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means "to attend to all public bills that come before the House, to watch their various stages, and to be present every day in the House, from its meeting to its rising, for the purpose of doing his duty with respect to them." Your lordship knows very well, that he does not so attend; but, supposing he does; what have you described here more than it is incumbent upon every member to do? Is it not the duty, the bounden duty, of every member "to attend to all public bills?" Aye, and to all private bills too. And what sort of a servant of the people must he be, if he be not in the House every day that his health will permit him? My Lord, my Lord! the sorrowful truth is, according to this the speech published under your name, that, out of 658 members of the House of Commons, not one is to be found willing constantly to attend to his duty there, without a large annual remuneration! And this truth, my lord, is proclaimed to the people, at the moment when this same House of Commons are daily calling upon them for new sacrifices, and expressing their regret that such sacrifices are indispensable to the safety of the country!—The proposition for calling the members alternately to the Chair, in the Committees of Ways and Means, your lordship is represented to have answered by the common observation, that, "what is every body's business is nobody's business." And, is this really the case, my Lord, in the House of Commons? Is a saying which has grown out of a general observation of the conduct of menial servants and others the lowest and least trust-worthy of mankind; is this saying, my lord, applicable to the representatives of the people; each of whom, be it recollected, makes his constituents a solemn promise to serve them with fidelity, and whom, collectively, the king calls his faithful Commons? What, my lord, is it nobody's business to attend to the passing of bills, unless they are paid for it? Is this really so; or have the printers misrepresented the speech of your lordship?—But, if the arguments of your lordship, which I have already noticed, are calculated to excite my surprise and regret; what shall I say of your answer to the proposition for letting the duty of Chairman be performed by the junior lords of the Treasury, or other paid persons, who have little or nothing to do? What is your argument in answer to this? "If the hon. gent. thinks there are any servants of government, who have no business attached to their offices, let him move for the abolition of those offices." "And," it

might have been added, "let him look at our majority!" Ah, my Lord! This is the old Pitt way of reasoning. It was with arguments like this that the Roses and the Longs so often gave a lumping and triumphant answer to the speeches of your deceased friend; and truly sorry am I to see you following, in this instance at least, so directly their steps. It was fine encouragement, too, for Mr. Biddulph to make a motion of this sort, when you had quashed his present motion (exactly of the same tendency) by an order of the day!—My lord, I hope to see the day, when order of the day will not be so powerful a gentleman as he is now; and, having no room to comment further upon the subject at present, I will conclude with saying, that, until that day comes, I, for my part, care very little, as to public matters, what days may come; being fully convinced, that no good to this country can possibly arise, while propositions like those of Mr. Biddulph are stifled by an order of the day. I will just add an expression of my earnest hope, that that gentleman will proceed as he has begun. He will have both INS and OUTS against him; but, he will have the people with him.

HANOVER.—When I took my motto, it was my intention to have shown, by the aid of a valuable correspondent, how injurious the interests of this Electorate had been to England, and to have pointed out the influence of it during the late negotiation. Want of room compels me to defer the intended remarks upon this subject. In the meanwhile, I beg leave to refer the reader to the article whence my motto is taken, and also to an admirable article upon the same subject, which he will find in the COURIER newspaper of Tuesday last, the 30th ultimo. The last sentence of that article is the very best I ever read in a newspaper. I honour the writer of it, and I beg the publisher of it to accept of my thanks.

THE SHERIDANS AND PLAY-ACTORS must wait till Mr. Homan has closed. My letter to him, which will be found immediately below, will explain how things stand with him. If he should want 5 or 6 columns more, however, he may have it. But, when he had taken up one letter with tracing back his high blood; and, if this was the mere spreading of his canvass, according to his own scene-painting expression, the reader will allow that I had but too much ground for alarm. He may take 6 columns more; that is to say, about forty pamphlet pages in the whole; but, he must close next week, or his letters must wait for convenience of insertion.

*** * * Errata.** In the last week's Register, p. 996 line 17 for *throw* read *thaw*; page 995 line 39 for *controvert* read *counteract*.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

The First Number of the Eighth Volume of COBBETT'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, will be ready for delivery on Thursday next. Complete Sets of the Work, from the Commencement in 1803, may be had of the Publisher, R. Bagshaw, Brydges Street, Covent Garden; of J. Budd, Pall Mall; and of all Booksellers and Newsmen.

TO MR. HOMAN.

SIR,—When I promised to insert *every word* that you might send for insertion, in defence of the Sheridans (or, rather, if my information be correct, every word that *they might write* in their defence), I must certainly have been understood, as not speaking without some limit, both as to *room* and *time*; and, therefore, upon perceiving that you have begun a *series* of letters to the Electors of Westminster, I think it right to apprize you, that I will set apart *ten columns* for you, leaving you the *next two numbers* to choose as to time; or, if you please, you may send five columns for each number. That this is quite time and room enough for any defence that can be made for the persons in question, you must, I think, readily allow; and it will be easily perceived, that, at a moment like the present, when important discussions are going on, in parliament as well as out of parliament, that I shall run some risk of incurring the dissatisfaction of my readers by suffering so large a space to be occupied by remarks upon such a subject. Go on, Sir. You shall not be interrupted. Complete your defence. It shall have a week to do execution. And then you shall hear me in answer. As I perceive you are disposed to be extremely free with the characters of the opponents of the Sheridans, I must beg of you not to libel too grossly anybody but myself. Of me you may say just what you please; but, I cannot suffer my Register to be a vehicle of abuse of my friends, especially if they are also distinguished friends of their country; and, moreover, this would be quite superfluous to Mr. Sheridan, who has the whole of the venal daily prints at his back.—I am, Sir, &c.—
Botley, Dec. 28, 1806.—WM. COBBETT.

DEFENCE OF MR. SHERIDAN.

Sir; I sincerely acknowledge that you act with fairness and magnanimity in having admitted my last letter to a place in your Register although sent so late, and in your promise to continue a similar indulgence. In con-

sequence, however, of the private communication I have since received from you, I am led to understand that you do not mean to allot me a place in your next paper. I do not repine at this, as I certainly conceive it will be an advantage to me to have a sight of your long and *loudly threatened* letter on the *Play-Actors'* Dinner, before I resume my subject—for the ensuing Saturday I will, without fail, submit to you my pretensions to occupy the five columns which you are pleased very handsomely (I speak it sincerely) to allot to my attack on yourself. At present I shall only repeat that you were wrong in your suspicion as to the persons who have either a knowledge of or have participated in what I write. You must be apprized by Mr. Wright who the only person is with whom I communicate. The only other point in your communication, certainly not meant to be private or confidential, upon which I shall say a word, is the following passage in your letter to me of the 28th Dec. "I must beg of you not to libel "too grossly anybody but myself;" to this I answer publicly, that I am not conscious of having libelled either you or your friends, and can only repeat what I communicated to you in my private letter, "I hold myself personally accountable as a gentleman for "every thing which falls from my pen," and without affecting to suppress feelings of indignation, I shall always feel myself responsible for any thing to which my name is attached.—I have the honor to be, Sir, your's, most respectfully,

1st Jan. 1807. FREDERICK HOMAN.
To Wm. Cobbett, Esq.

WEST-INDIAN SUGAR ESTATES.

SIR,—I am glad that parliament has at last taken into its consideration, the ruinous condition of the persons concerned in West-Indian estates which produce sugar; much of which commodity has of late not returned to the producers of it a price adequate to the mere expense of manufacturing it from the cane, and importing it hither, without including the previous expense of purchasing the land on which the cane grew, planting and cultivating that land, erecting works for the manufacturing processes, and paying the salaries and wages of the persons necessarily employed in superintending and transacting the incessant, various, and complicated business of a sugar estate. Much sugar has, I believe, within the last two months been sold for 50s. or less per cwt. the charges payable in this country on the same are, duty 27s. interest on ditto 6d., freight 9s. Qd., landing, warehousing,

cooperage, insurance from fire 1s. 9d., insurance on the voyage, duty and commission on the same 2s. 3d., commission and brokerage on the sale 1s. 6d. Total 42s. 6d. leaving the proprietor 7s. 6d. per cwt., or about three farthings per lb. I know that many notable housewives suppose, that because they pay more than they used to do for their sugar, the gains of those who produce that sugar must also be greater than they were. If, indeed, the money gains of sugar growers had of late years very considerably increased, they would only have partaken, as in reason and justice they ought to have partaken, of the general effect of the astonishing quantity of taxes imposed, and of the other various incidents by which the exchangeable value of money has during the last thirty years been so exorbitantly depreciated. But the fact is, as you Mr. Cobbett, and all persons in the least conversant with the subject very well know, and has been proved times without number, even the nominal gains of the sugar grower, not only have not in the least advanced, not even have they kept stationary; but for many years they have been most grievously diminished, and of late they have either been converted into a loss, or at best reduced to nothing; insomuch, that if the conduct of a sugar estate required nothing but mere agricultural labour, or if the buildings and machinery upon it were capable of being converted to other purposes, there cannot be a doubt, that a vast deal of the land heretofore destined to the growth of sugar, would either have been employed otherwise, or not cultivated at all. But every sugar estate containing 300 acres of sugar cane land, has on it buildings and machinery, which have cost from fifteen to twenty thousand pounds, and which are inapplicable to other purposes, than that of sugar manufacture. Rather, therefore, than at once immediately abandon the whole of their capital, and condemn themselves to ruin without the possibility of recovery or mitigation, sugar planters have continued to cultivate their estates without profit, and even at a loss, in the hope of some relief either from the course of general events, or from the interposition of the legislature of their country. To the other causes of British West-Indian calamities, have lately been added Buonaparté's vigorous efforts to exclude from the Continent every particle of their produce. It is very easy to talk of the inefficacy of such prohibitions, and of the irresistible power of commerce to evade them. It is much more easy to advance such propositions, than to prove them. From a document put into my hands

by a person upon whose information I believe, I may most safely rely, I can prove to the most incredulous, that Buonaparté had succeeded to a most alarming degree in the attainment of this his favourite object, even before he had enforced his prohibitions with the severity and to the extent to which they have just now been carried. On the 5th of July last, there remained in the public warehouses of the port of London 81,626 cwt. of sugar. Between that day and the 10th of October following, there were landed 855,332 cwt. Within the same period there were exported only 11,606 cwt. and on the 10th of October there remained in the same public warehouses 393,499 cwt. In the *Morning Chronicle* of this day (Dec. 31) it is represented that Lord Temple yesterday stated in the House of Commons, that there were in the port of London not less than 80 or 90 thousand hogsheads of sugar. A hogshead of sugar on an average weighs about 14 cwt. If we take the medium of Lord Temple's quantities (85 thousand hogsheads) it will appear that there are not less than 1,120,000 cwt. of sugar in the port of London (and I imagine that not above two-thirds of last year's crops have been yet received). It is evident, therefore, both from the smallness of the export, and from the magnitude of the quantity on hand, that Buonaparté has not undertaken an impracticable measure. It is evident also, that in consequence of his having thus dammed up this great outlet, by which the excess of our importation of sugar used to be carried off, a vast quantity of that commodity must remain useless, and be totally lost to the country, unless some mode of consumption can be adopted, to compensate that which has been lost. The breweries and distilleries offer such a mode of consumption with circumstances of considerable advantage to the nation at large, and without any circumstances of detriment. And by availing ourselves of this resource, we shall not only avoid great part of the evil which Buonaparté hoped to bring upon us by his exclusive system, but we shall cause the evils of that system to be most acutely felt throughout the countries under his dominion; and thus make his curse recoil upon his own head.—I observe that a member for a corn county (Mr. Baker) seems to be apprehensive, that the introduction of sugar into breweries and distilleries will be injurious to the landed interest, by diminishing the price of corn. Unless the proposed measure be executed in a most careless or bungling manner, no danger of that kind need be apprehended. It is very notorious, that for a long time past the corn

produced in this kingdom has been much less than the quantity required for its consumption. I have not at this moment by me any public documents on this subject; but the deficiency is undoubtedly very considerable: and there is most satisfactory evidence, as Mr. Malthus has well stated and explained, that it every year grows greater. From the accounts of imports and exports parliament may easily ascertain what has of late been the average annual deficiency; and from the excise office accounts of the quantity and strength of the wash for making corn spirits, parliament may obtain a pretty near approximation to the quantity of corn used in the distilleries. Few people, I believe, will doubt that the former—the quantity of corn imported—is greater than the latter, the quantity of corn used in the distilleries; or, in other words, that if not a single bushel of corn were used in distillation, we should still be under a permanent necessity of importing corn. Now, this being the case, it is most manifest, that parliament possesses the power of keeping the price of corn at that height, which shall be judged necessary to afford the owners and occupiers of land a sufficient rent for their estates, profit on their capitals, and salaries for their time and labour. Parliament has only to prohibit importation when the price of corn is beneath this height; and the thing is done. On the expediency of diminishing our dependence on foreign, and they may be hostile nations, for the staff of life, I shall for the present say nothing; but, I hope, Mr. Baker will by this time be satisfied, that, unless parliament be much more negligent of the landed interest than we can suppose it will be, as long as such active vigilant and intelligent champions of that body as his most respectable colleague and himself have seats in the House of Commons, he need not entertain any apprehension, that the price of the quartern loaf will ever be lowered one single farthing below its reasonable price by the rivalry of sugar. But there is another rivalry, to which I will take this opportunity of calling the attention of Mr. Baker, and of every friend to their country. I mean the rivalry of foreign brandies, particularly French. How much of the national wealth was expended to enrich our enemies by the purchase of this article, was long ago repeatedly suggested in your valuable work; and more particular information on the subject was last year laid before the House of Commons, on the motion of Mr. Brooke: and lamentable was it to see, that a most enormous portion of this expenditure proceeded not from the unthinking or unfeeling

luxury of selfish individuals, but from the sage and patriotic administration of public money by the officers employed for victualling the navy. In consequence of the gross facts, which Mr. Brooke's motions disclosed, I understood a check was promised to be applied to such proceedings of the victualling officers; and that they were ordered not to buy French brandies, unless they should be threepence a quart cheaper than British West Indian rums. How far this has been carried into effect I know not. (I perceive the victualling offices still advertise for both articles); but this I know, that the promise itself exhibited a most contemptible contrast to the vigorous hostility of our arch foe. It is not in this way that Buonaparté attacks us. It is not by the despicable peddlery of *threepenny preferences*, that he thwarts our commerce, and assails our resources. He excludes our productions out of every port from the Adriatic to the Baltic. And our revenge is a *threepenny preference* of our own spirits over his! Wines and brandies are now almost the only remaining staples of France; and for both, particularly the latter, this country is a principal market. By excluding it, we should add in an imminent degree to the distresses of the enemy. And it is indisputable, that we ourselves should not suffer the slightest inconvenience from the measure; for if our own distillers were encouraged by the promise of a permanent market to direct their science and practical skill to that object, they could produce from sugar a spirit not to be distinguished from the choicest cogniac. All chymists know, that the basis of all distilled and fermented liquors is sugar: and substances are fit or unfit for the production of such liquors, as they abound or are deficient in saccharine matter. M. Beaume a celebrated French chymist in his work entitled *Mémoires sur la meilleure Manière de construire les Alembiques*. Paris, 8vo. 1778, says "there is but one kind of wine in nature; and the only substance which produces wine is sugar. By a proper use of sugar, a perfect imitation may be made of the best wines in France, and other countries: and spirits, equal to the best distilled from wine, may be obtained from sugar; and it will be impossible by chymical analysis to distinguish one kind from the other." On the same subject see also *Biographia Britannica*, vol. 4. Art. Goddard and Dr. Shaw's *Chymical Lectures*. Yours, &c. X. X.—Dec. 31, 1806.

THE ARMY.

SIR,—At the bottom of page 906, in

your
calcu
with
you
rate
of o
milli
derst
whi
calcu
strate
200,
ea
200
ea
to
200
in
am
200
in
am
200
ea
200
nur
Addit
sion
lion

But
your s
every
the ar
habits
man,
geniou
cidatio
tion o
shamer
drones
suppor
the me
offer th
and to
droopin
scarcely
the ho
heard
now in
of all ra
regimen
obedien
15, 180

SIR,—
defaction
of Satur

your last Saturday's Register, you state upon calculation that an army of 200,000 men, with the proportionate number of officers you have assigned it, and with the increased rate of pay you have there given to each class of officers, would cost a sum far short of 4 millions per annum. I must greatly misunderstand you, Sir, if this is not an error, which I think the following statement, calculated upon your own data, must demonstrate.

| | |
|---|---------------|
| 200,000 men at 20l. per annum | |
| each man, amounts alone to | - 4,000,000 |
| 200 battalions with 10 ensigns in each, at 7s. per diem, amounts to | - - - 255,500 |
| 200 battalions with 10 lieutenants in each, at 12s. per diem each, amounts to | - - - 438,000 |
| 200 battalions with 10 captains in each, at 20s. per diem each, amounts to | - - - 730,000 |
| 200 majors at 500l. per annum each | - - - 100,000 |
| 200 colonels at 1000l. per annum each | - - - 200,000 |
| Additional pay to non-commissioned officers for 200 battalions, at 400l. per annum each | 80,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | £5,503,500 |

But, Sir, whatever error there may be on your side, or on mine in this calculation, every man, and particularly every officer in the army, bearing about him the common habits, and the common feelings of a gentleman, must thank you for entering in the ingenious manner you have done, into an elucidation of the causes of that enormous portion of our expenditure, so grossly and so shamefully abused, which give to idle drones, and nerveless loungers, the means of supporting immense establishments, whilst the men of adventure and of courage, who offer their lives to the ravages of climates, and to the swords of their enemies, are drooping in penury and wretchedness, scarcely able to preserve themselves from the horrors of a goal. Indeed, Sir, I have heard from good authority, that there are now in the King's Bench prison alone officers of all ranks, sufficient to furnish above three regiments of the line.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant—A. C.—December 15, 1806.

SINECURES AND PENSIONS.

SIR,—I have just read with much satisfaction your observations in the Register of Saturday last, relative to the abolition of

sinecure places. Such a measure at such a time as this would give real strength to the country, not merely by the saving it would occasion in the public expenditure, but by the strong attachment and gratitude it would excite in the people towards a government who would consent to it. But, Sir, it is too much to expect that government or any party in the state will bring forward such a measure, unless the people themselves will be at the trouble to give some proof that they desire it. I hope, therefore, you will recommend petitions to the House of Commons, and public meetings to be held for the purpose, or, if public meetings (unless for party views) require more exertion in the people than can be expected from the apathy of the times, let a few respectable individuals frame a petition and advertise it for signature.—After considering your excellent observations and illustrations, both of the utility and practicability of such a measure of reform, I have only to suggest one remark upon this topic. I would not wish the abolition of sinecures to be indiscriminate and universal, but would continue either the whole or part of the sinecure to the holder in every instance where he could prove to the satisfaction of a committee of the House, that he has no other provision, or but an inadequate provision for a comfortable support suitable to his rank in society. In that case I would continue the sinecure during the life of the holder. Let petitions to parliament be framed upon this principle, and for this object, and presented without delay. They will be no doubt a great treat to our new members, and an amusing novelty to the old.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, D. W. Dec. 15, 1806.

MR. CANNING'S AMENDMENT,

As published in the Courier News-paper of the 22d December, 1806.

I. To assure his Majesty that it is with increased affection, attachment and loyalty, that his Majesty's faithful Commons meet his Majesty in this ninth Parliament of his Majesty's assembling. And that, amidst all those evils and pressures of war, and those tremendous and unparalleled successes of a formidable and unrelenting enemy, which render the present crisis peculiarly awful and alarming, the first and most fervent prayer of his Majesty's faithful Commons is, that it may please Divine Providence to grant to this favoured country the prolongation of a life and of a reign, the value and the blessings of which each succeeding year teaches us more highly to appreciate.—II. And to express to his Majesty our unshaken determination to

stand by his Majesty throughout all the difficulties and dangers of the times; in defence of the laws and liberties of this realm; in defence of his Majesty's sacred person and Government; and of a throne endeared to all classes of his Majesty's subjects by the virtues of the Sovereign who adorns it—III. To offer to his Majesty our humble and affectionate condolence on that share of the public calamities of Europe which has come home to the personal and domestic feelings of his Majesty and his Royal Family, by the death of that gallant and illustrious Prince the late Duke of Brunswick, a Prince connected by such near alliances with his Majesty's Royal House, and with the Throne of these Kingdoms.—IV. That whilst we most sensibly participate in the deep and poignant grief with which his Majesty contemplates the issue of the late campaign on the Continent, we studiously abstain from suggesting to his Majesty, as a topic of consolation, what we well know his Majesty's intelligence and magnanimity would disdain to receive as such—the interruption of his Majesty's intercourse with the Court of Berlin during the last eight months, which precluded his Majesty from any knowledge of those counsels by which the war between Prussia and France was so unfortunately precipitated—V. Satisfied, as we are, of the justice of the original grounds of his Majesty's complaints against Prussia, we are yet unable to refrain from deeply deploring their consequences.—VI. We are not furnished with any means of judging how far those complaints were capable of being adjusted, without recourse being had to actual hostilities; or how far any discussions which may have taken place subsequently to his Majesty's gracious message of the 21st April, were directed to that object.—VII. But we cannot but lament that the obvious artifice of the common enemy, in making a fraudulent and nominal transfer of his Majesty's Electoral dominions to the King of Prussia, should have been so far crowned with success as to have involved his Majesty in war with the only State of Europe whose resources were yet unimpaired, and whose arms might, at some happier hour, have been employed with effect in a new confederacy against France; and that the too successful policy of the enemy in amusing this country with an insincere and protracted negotiation, should have obtained for France the opportunity of goading Prussia (by unmeasured and accumulated injuries) to that premature, unconcerted, and unassisted ef-

fort, which has terminated in the overthrow of that powerful monarchy, and in the complete subjugation of its dominions.—VIII. We cannot but express our regret that the policy which appears to have been ultimately adopted towards Prussia, should not have been recognized and acted upon until the occasion was gone by; and that his Majesty's Plenipotentiary should have arrived only in time to be an helpless witness of that prodigious ruin and destruction which it more timely interposition of his Majesty's advice and assistance might possibly have averted or alleviated.—IX. To acknowledge his Majesty's goodness in having directed to be laid before us the details of the negotiation so long carried on at Paris.—X. We entertain the fullest conviction that the just and moderate sentiments by which his Majesty has proved himself to have been animated in the several preceding negotiations for peace with France, have alike actuated his Majesty on the late occasion: and while we look with anxious interest for the development of those circumstances which can have deferred for so long a period that termination of the negotiation which it is evident, as well from notorious facts as from the language of his Majesty's declaration, the artifices and pretensions of the enemy rendered from the beginning almost certain and unavoidable; we doubt not but we shall see in the whole course and tenor of the proceedings on the part of his Majesty, fresh instances of that desire for peace, and of that sincerity and good faith in the pursuit of it, which have so often been frustrated by the ambition of the French Government; as well as fresh proofs of the expediency of adhering to the policy of treating for general peace, and only in conjunction with our allies.—XI. That we receive with the utmost satisfaction the assurance of his Majesty's uninterrupted concert and good understanding with the Emperor of Russia, and the King of Sweden, trusting that neither in war nor in negotiation, his Majesty's councils will be separated from those of our Allies distinguished by perseverance and good faith.—XII. The continued prosecution of the war being necessarily imposed upon his Majesty, we trust that it is intended to prosecute it with vigour: earnestly imploring his Majesty that no apprehension of embarrassing the conduct of a negotiation by acquisitions made during its progress may ever again be suffered to relax for a moment the military and naval operations of this country.

To be continued.